IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3743 OF 2003

Single Bench

PETITIONER : Sachidanand Prasad, Son of late Shri Ishwari Prasad, aged about 65 years, resident of Jaiguru Pashuahar Kendra, Near Punjab Garden, Ambikapur, District : Surguja (C G).

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh through : The Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur.
2. The Asst. Commissioner, Tribal Development, Ambikapur District : Surguja (C G)
3. The Dy. Director, Tribal Welfare Department, Ambikapur, Distt : Surguja (C G).
4. The Collector, Ambikapur, District : Surguja (C G)
5. The Accountant General, Raipur, (C G).
6. Block Education Officer, Sitapur, Distt : Surguja (C G).
7. Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Panchayat, Surguja, Ambikapur, (C G).

P. R. No. 3553/03 Presented by Shri D.S. Shukarma dated 13.11.03

शपथ आयुक्त एस.के. शुक्ला जिला सरगुजा (म.प्र.) सीतापुर तहसील कोर्ट

RECEIVED COPY 13/11 Clerk to A G. Bilaspur

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

DETAILS OF THE PETITION :

1. Particulars of the Petitioner :

As mentioned above in the cause title.

26

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 3743 सन् 2003

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13.02.2004 Shri V.K. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Ranbir Singh Marhas, Govt. Advocate for the State. The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226 & 227 of the Constitution of India being aggrieved on account of the inaction on the part of the respondents for not sanctioning all the retrial benefits to the petitioner. The case of the petitioner is that he was working as Head Master and retired on 29.01.2001 from the said post but the respondents have not paid the retrial dues to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has made various representations to the concerned authorities but they have not considered the same, therefore, he submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2, and respondent No.2 may be directed to decide the same, to which learned State counsel has no objection. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2, raising all his grievances within a period of 15 days from today and in turn, respondent No.2, after considering all the grievances raised by the petitioner, shall pass orders on the representation within a period of another 60 days from the date of the receipt of the same in an objective manner in accordance with the law. With the above directions, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, I.A. No.11,806/03 stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	

Roshan/ 20.02.04

[पीछे दे